

01
02
03
04
05
06 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
07 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

08 REVEREND DR. KAMAL K. ROY,) CASE NO. C08-0616-TSZ
09 Plaintiff,)
10 v.) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
11 PRESIDENTIAL RACE 2008, et al.,)
12 Defendants.)
13

14 Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP)
15 and a complaint. (Dkt. 1.) Among other problems, the complaint is unintelligible and fails to
16 clarify all of the specific defendants named or the relief sought. It consists of some forty-eight
17 typed and handwritten pages and copies of correspondence and documents, with many pages
18 containing handwritten comments/notations scrawled around the borders of the page or between
19 paragraphs.

20 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), this Court may deny an application to proceed IFP
21 and should dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be
22 granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *O'Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir.

1990). An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

Here, plaintiff fails to allege sufficient facts to place defendants on notice of the nature of his claims or otherwise provide any basis for jurisdiction in this Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Because this action appears frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

Plaintiff has submitted a number of similar proposed complaints in this and other courts.¹ The Court advises plaintiff of his responsibility to research the facts and law before filing a complaint in order to determine whether his claim for relief is frivolous. If plaintiff files a frivolous action, he may be sanctioned. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The Court would likely impose a sanction of dismissal on any frivolous complaint. If plaintiff files numerous frivolous or malicious complaints, the Court may bar him from proceeding in this Court. *See DeLong v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146-48 (9th Cir. 1990) (discussing bar order requirements).

Because of the deficiencies in plaintiff’s proposed complaint, his request to proceed IFP should be DENIED and this case DISMISSED without prejudice. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

///

///

¹ *See, e.g., Roy v. United States of America*, C08-0357-RAJ (W.D. Wash. 2008); *Roy v. United States of America*, C08-0035-TSZ (W.D. Wash. 2008); *Roy v. Brooks*, C07-1924-MJP (W.D. Wash. 2007); *Roy v. World Religious School and University*, C07-1742-TSZ (W.D. Wash. 2007); *Roy v. All State Board of Elections*, C07-1419-RSL (W.D. Wash. 2007); *Roy v. Roberts*, C07-1157-TSZ (W.D. Wash. 2007); *Roy v. Bush*, C07-484-JCC (W.D. Wash. 2007). (*See also* Dkt. 1, Complaint (containing evidence of numerous complaints filed outside of this district).)

01 A proposed order of dismissal accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

02 DATED this 24th day of April, 2008.

03 

04 Mary Alice Theiler
05 United States Magistrate Judge
06
07
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22